IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE GODA RAGHURAM

WRIT PETITION NO : 10244 of 2005

Between:

1.K.C.Nagaraja Naik, S/o. K.C.Pratap Naik,
R/o. Flat No.304, Chandrapirya Apartments,
Adimthy Nagar, Anantapur.
2.K.Bharat Singh Naik, S/o. Narasimha Naik,
R/o. D.No. 7-17-372, Mallikarjunapet,
Guntur.
3.N.Ravi Babu, S/o. Ramana Rao,
R/o. Allur Villge & Post, Via Nizampatnam,
Guntur District.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 The Union Public Service Commission, Government of India, rep.by Chairman, New Delhi-1
2 The AP Public Service Commission, Government of Andhra Pradesh, rep.by Chairman, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, order or direction more in the nature of writ of Mandamus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, declaring the action of the 2nd respondent in not considering the representation of the petitioners dated 31.3.2005 and 7.4.2005 seeking reschedule of the 1st phase of the Group I mains in consonance with the schedule of the 1st respondent as being descriminatory, arbitrary, bias, illegal and unconstitutional as opposed to the guarantes embodies in articles 14,15,16,19,21 and 46 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the 2nd respondent Viz. the Andhra Pradesh Public Service Commission, Hyderabad to reschedule the Group I main examinations in so far as the SC and ST candidates are concerned and pass such other order or orders or as are deemed fit and proper.

Counsel for the Petitioner: Mr. B.Prakasam for MR.B.S.V.PRAKASH KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: MR.KANTHI NARAHARI

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: Mr.M.vijaya Kumar

The Court made the following :

ORAL ORDER

Sri B.Prakasam, Advocate representing Sri B.S.V.Prakash Kumar, counsel for the petitioners states that the grievance in this writ petition no longer survives.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

No order as to costs.

_____

GODA RAGHURAM,J

13TH JUNE 2005

*TSNR

To

1 The Chairman, Union Public Service Commission, Government of India, New Delhi-1
2 The Chairman, AP Public Service Commission, Government of Andhra Pradesh,Hyderabad.

3 Two C.D.Copies.